

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 are pending.

The claims have been amended to more clearly and distinctly recite the subject matter that applicant regards as his invention. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to recite receiving the program stream data using a first type of transfer mechanism and receiving the bit-map data using a second type of transfer mechanism. Claims 8 and 9 have been amended to recite that the first transfer mechanism is an isochronous transfer mechanism and that the second transfer mechanism is an asynchronous transfer mechanism. No new matter is believed to be added by the present amendment.

Objection of claim 5.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite "... a video disc player coupled to said digital television..." Applicant submits that the objection is overcome in view of the amendment.

Rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Gadre et al (US 5,965,161).

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1-4 are not anticipated by Gadre et al.

Gadre et al. discloses a video processing system that includes a subvideo processor for processing subvideo data included with the program data. The program data and the subvideo data is received in television 18 via input 22. However, nowhere does Gadre et al. disclose or suggest that the program data is received via a first type of transfer mechanism of the digital bus and the subvideo data is received via a second type of transfer mechanism of the digital bus as recited in amended claim 1. Gadre et al. says nothing in this regard. Thus, applicants submit that Gadre et al. fails to disclose or suggest a notable feature of amended claims 1-4, and as such, amended claims 1-4 are not anticipated by Gadre et al.

Rejection of claims 1-2 and 10-11 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakai et al. (US 5,999,698)

Applicant submits that for the reasons discussed below amended claims 1-2 and 10-11 are not anticipated by Nakai et al.

Nakai relates to a video disk player that provides, to a user, an indication that a multi-angle video portion is available. In that regard, the video disk player according to Nakai comprises known video disk player elements, including a mechanism for reading data from the disk, system processor 54, video decoder 58, sub-picture decoder 62, and video mixer 64A. The video decoder 58, sub-picture decoder 62 and video mixer 64A operate in the known manner to decode the compressed video data, decode the sub-picture data, and combine the video data and the sub-picture data.

Applicant submits that the teachings of Nakai are not relevant to amended claims 1-2 because the teachings of Nakai and amended claims 1-2 are directed to a different subject matter. That is, the teachings of Nakai are directed to a video disc player and the components therein, whereas amended claims 1-2 are directed to a method for operating a **digital video processing apparatus connected to the digital video disc player via a digital bus.**

In any event, applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 10, and claims 2 and 12 which depends therefrom, are not anticipated by Nakai because Nakai fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of transferring the reformatted program content stream via a first type of transfer mechanism of the digital bus and transferring bit-map data representing subpicture information via a second type of transfer mechanism of the digital bus.

As noted above, the teachings of Nakai are directed to a video disc player and the components therein. In that regard, the examiner cites the bus connection between decoder 58 and processor 64, and the bus connection between decoder 62 and processor 64. However, although decoder 58 and decoder 62 are shown to be connected to processor 64 via separate bus connections, applicants are unable to find any **teaching or suggestion that data is transferred from the decoders 58 and 62 to processor 64 using different types of data transfer mechanisms.** The fact that different bus connections are used does not necessarily means that different types of data transfer mechanisms are used. Applicant has carefully reviewed Nakai and is unable to find any teaching regarding the use of different types of data transfer mechanism between the

various decoders and processor within the disc player, or why it would be desirable to do so.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that Nakai fails to disclose notable features of amended claims 1-2 and 10-11, and as such, these claims are not anticipated by Nakai.

Rejection of claims 1-4 and 8-12 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Komeno (US 6,351,599).

Applicant submits that for the reasons discussed below amended claims 1-4 and 8-12 are not anticipated by Komeno.

Komeno discloses a system that enables a user to easily determine and view programs stored in an image storage device. In that regard, Komeno teaches transmitting, to an image display control circuit 13, a menu image from a menu display part 18, picture images from selected picture image display part 21, and picture images from display determining part 23. The menu image provides a list of the programs stored on the storage device (col. 5, lines 60-65). The selected picture image display part provides a sequence of pictures associated with a program that corresponds to the current position of the cursor (col. 8, lines 16-22). The image display control circuit 13 generates the image shown on the display device 11 based on the video signals received from parts 18, 21 and 23.

First, Applicant notes that Komeno does not disclose transmitting to a display device a program content stream that includes data in a compressed format. The system of Komeno includes a picture image expanding part 22, which serves to read the data from the storage device 14, **expand the compressed image data** and send the data to either parts 21 or 23 (col. 5, lines 27-34). Parts 21 and 23 then send the picture image or video signals to control circuit 13 (col. 8, lines 11-16; col. 8, lines 56-62). Thus, Komeno teaches that the image data is expanded before the data is transferred to display device 11.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that Komeno fails to disclose the feature that the program content stream is received or transmitted via a first type of transfer mechanism of the digital bus, and the bit-map data is received or transmitted via a second type of transfer mechanism of the digital bus.

Col. 5, lines 5-35 is cited as describing the transfer of the program content via a first transfer mechanism. However, this cited portion of Komeno describes the operation of image display part 21, display determining part 23 and image expanding part 22, and the connections therebetween. Komeno mentions that the image display part 21 and the display determining part 23 transmit the determined picture image data or video signals to the display control circuit 13 (col. 5, lines 13-12-14, and lines 24-26).

Fig. 1 is cited as showing the transfer of bit map data via a second transfer mechanism. In that regard, Komeno mentions that the menu generating part 19, like image display part 21 and display determining part 23, transmits a picture image or a video image signal to display control circuit 13. Again, Komeno makes no mention of transferring a compressed program stream via a first type of transfer mechanism and bit map data representing subpicture information via a second type of transfer mechanism. Applicant has carefully reviewed Komeno and is unable to find any teaching in that regard.

Thus, Applicant submits that Komeno fails to disclose or suggest notable features of amended claims 1-4 and 8-12, and as such, these claims are not anticipated by Komeno.

Rejection of claims 1-4 and 8-12 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stahl (US 6,665,020) in view of Chung (US 6,507,696).

Applicants respectfully submit that for the reasons discussed below amended claims 1-4 and 8-12 are patentably distinguishable over Stahl in view of Chung.

Applicants submit that the combination of Stahl and Chung fail to teach or suggest the feature of a program content stream being received via a first type of transfer mechanism, and bit-map data representative of a subpicture associated with the program content stream being received via a second type of transfer mechanism.

Stahl relates to a system for providing a minimal level of interoperability for exchanging A/V content and associated control between devices coupled via a digital bus. More specifically, Stahl relates to using standard control language to transfer universal remote control message across the digital bus (col. 2, lines 22-

37). In this regard, the bit-mapped menu mentioned in Stahl refers to an On Screen Display associated with controlling the operation of the device, not to a subpicture associated with the program content stream. They are different types of displays. Stahl does not disclose or suggest the above-mentioned limitation of claims 1-4 and 8-12.

Chung likewise fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned limitation. Chung is cited as teaching the feature of receiving program content and subpicture data from a disc player. Applicant acknowledges that use of such data streams in the disc player is known. Chung is directed to merging and displaying application data stream with the DVD data stream. However, Chung fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned limitations of amended claims 1-4 and 8-12. Therefore, Applicant submits that the combination of Stahl and Chung fail to disclose or suggest a notable feature of the subject claims, and as such, these claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art references.

Rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagihara (US 6,211,800) in view of Kitamura et al (US 6,031,963).

Applicant submits that for the reasons discussed below amended claims 1-4 are patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Yanagihara and Kitamura et al.

The teachings of Yanagihara have been discussed in applicant's prior response. Essentially, Yanagihara teaches converting an MPEG program stream data into a transport stream and transmitting the converted stream to a presentation device via a 1394 bus. However, Yanagihara does not disclose or suggest the above-mentioned feature of amended claim 1. Namely, a program content stream being received via a first type of transfer mechanism, and bit-map data representative of a subpicture associated with the program content stream being received via a second type of transfer mechanism.

The examiner alleges that it would be obvious to modify Yanagihara with Nakai by providing bitmap means for processing the subpicture as a bit map. However, such a modification still does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature of claim 1.

Kitamura is cited as teaching updating the subpicture by processing the subpicture menu. However, the teaching of Kitamura fails to cure the defect of Yanagihara with respect to amended claim 1. Thus, applicant submits that amended claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over Yanagihara and Kitamura.

Rejection of claims 5 and 7-9 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komeno (US 6,351,599) in view of Yanagihara (US 6,211,800).

Applicant submits that for the reasons discussed below amended claims 1-4 are patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Komeno in view of Yanagihara.

The teachings of Komeno and Yanagihara have been discussed herein above.

In that regard, applicant submits that neither Komeno nor Yanagihara teach or suggest transmitting the MPEG-TS digital stream to the digital television via an isochronous channel of the digital bus, and transmitting the bit-mapped digital data to the digital television via an asynchronous channel as recited in claim 5. Thus, applicant submits that the combination of Komeno and Yanagihara still fail to teach or suggest a notable feature of claims 5 and 7, and as such, these claims are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Komeno and Yangihara.

Further, applicant submits that neither Komeno nor Yanagihara teach or suggest a program content stream being received via a **first type of transfer mechanism**, and bit-map data representative of a subpicture associated with the program content stream being received via a **second type of transfer mechanism** as recited in claim 1. Thus, applicant submits that the combination of Komeno and Yanagihara still fail to teach or suggest a notable feature of claims 8 and 9, which depend from amended claim 1, and as such, these claims are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Komeno and Yanagihara.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request such action. No fee is believed due in regard to the present amendment. However, if a fee is due, please charge the fee to Deposit Account 07-0832. Should any questions arise regarding any of the above, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at 609-734-6815.

Respectfully submitted,
T. Stahl



By: Paul P. Kiel
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing Inc.
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: Oct. 1, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

10-1-04
Date

Karen Schlauch
Karen Schlauch